



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

AUGUST, 1916

POLITICAL PLEDGES

BY THE EDITOR

MAUD is dead. Born in Petersburg, Indiana, in the year of Our Lord 1874, she survived all of her contemporaries by dieting chiefly on hope, but now she has passed to the bourne whence no traveler returns except by way of reincarnation. Some say she was chloroformed, but we prefer to believe that she died of a broken heart. In any case, her end was peaceful. It is well. But never shall we see her like again. Carefully reared as the most promising member of the household of Mr. William R. Berridge, her early years were devoid of noteworthy incident, but in 1896 the world was electrified by the announcement that she would accompany William Jennings Bryan to Washington as a participant in his prospective inauguration.

Fate intervening, however, she remained at home comforted by the assurance that her health should be preserved until the people should rule. Disappointed in 1900, she bore up with the cheerfulness of noble resignation until 1908, when again suitable accommodations for a sojourn to the National capital in the ensuing March were reserved. But when the time came, Mr. Bryan failed to call for her, as had been arranged, and she remained at home in cloistered aloofness, speaking little but thinking much, as well became one playing the part of the Colonel Mouse of that day and generation.

It was she, we are told, who finally persuaded her idol to accept the position of Secretary of State as a stepping stone to the Presidency. Not until the great severance came under the roof of the White House and the simultaneous blessings of the Almighty did she lose heart, but that untoward episode was her last straw. She pined away and died, and Mr. Berridge cut deep into her tombstone these words: "Here lies MAUD, aetat 42, the Most Faithful Mule (except John W. Kern) in All Indiana. *Requiescat in pace!*" And when Mr. Bryan beheld the *pace* he lifted up his voice and wept.

The reader now knows why the Democratic platform of 1916 differs from that of 1912. Mr. Bryan's mentor and confidential adviser had passed away and with her the source of his inspiration. So President Wilson was left free, if not particularly easy, to compound his own principles for the allurements of the electorate. And thus, by a quite natural though somewhat circuitous route, we arrive at the Issues of the Campaign as officially declared and defined.

Time was when party platforms were considered and discussed with great seriousness. The custom of submitting a declaration of alleged principles originated in the convention which renominated Martin Van Buren in 1840, when it was resolved, that "the Federal Government is one of limited powers"; that it had no right to inaugurate "a general system of internal improvements," such as National highways; that it must not "foster one branch of industry," even the manufacture of dyestuffs; that it should provide "ample protection of person and property from foreign aggression" on the seas, in Mexico or elsewhere; that the States are "the sole and proper judges of their own affairs," etc., etc.,—just such a compendium of Democratic doctrines, in a word, as would now, if anything could, delight the heart of Colonel Henry Watterson. There was no lack of explicitness in the declaration, but after all it was only a statement of admirable theories rather than an aggregation of positive pledges, as of the present day. As a politician, President Van Buren may have been no cleverer than President Wilson, but assuredly he was more cautious. We doubt greatly, for example, if he would now have exulted at "our keeping of pledges," in recollection of the firm assertion in 1912 that "our pledges are made to be kept while in office" and of the candidate's repeated averments that "we say

what we mean and mean what we say." To "challenge" an adversary may be well enough while presumably in a fighting mood, but to invite critical examination by impartial minds of a record far from invulnerable is quite another matter. We cheerlessly recall a few of the Pledges of 1912.

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government under the constitution has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of government honestly and economically administered.

In theory, the Democratic party repudiated this "fundamental principle" when at St. Louis it merely reaffirmed "our belief in the doctrine of providing sufficient revenue for the operation of the Government" and, in practice, it accepted the protective system when, in Congress, it put protective duties upon dyestuffs. Of the Underwood tariff, which was "unreservedly endorsed" at St. Louis as "truly exemplifying that doctrine" of tariff for revenue, Speaker Clark frankly remarked in the House, "I can take this tariff schedule and so arrange it that the American people will not have to pay any more than they are now paying and get twice as much out of this tariff system as we are getting now." And of the proposed Tariff Commission, Leader Claude Kitchin plaintively observed, "It is only within the past two months that the Democratic party (meaning President Wilson) has been in favor of such a Commission." The "right and power" to impose protective duties, denied in 1912, is now conceded and exercised; the time-honored "tariff-for-revenue-only" is abandoned; and the Pledge of 1912 is broken, for the quite obvious purpose of depriving the opposition of an issue.

We favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other Powers.

Proposal rejected by Democratic votes.

The law pertaining to the civil service should be honestly and rightly enforced, to the end that merit and ability shall be the standard of appointment and promotion, rather than service rendered to a political party.

Witness the revocation of "all executive orders heretofore made placing the positions of deputy marshals and deputy internal-revenue collectors in the classified service," the substitution of incompetent political hacks for trained men in the diplomatic service and the famous Burleson raids upon the post-offices.

We recognize the urgent need of reform in the administration of civil and criminal law in the United States, and we recommend the enactment of such legislation and the promotion of such measures as will rid the present legal system of delays, expense and uncertainties incident to the system as now administered.

Nothing done.

We demand for the people of Alaska the full enjoyment of the rights and privileges of a territorial form of government, and we believe that the officials appointed to administer the government of all our territories and the District of Columbia, should be qualified by previous bona fide residence.

Alaska forgotten. Governors appointed: The Philippines, Burton Harrison of New York, who had never seen the Philippines; Porto Rico, Arthur Yager of Kentucky, who had never seen Porto Rico.

We favor the exemption from tolls of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal.

Exemption beaten at the behest of the President—a proper act, but a broken pledge.

We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine, which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister republics of the South, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the public treasury.

Now pending: The Wilson-McAdoo bill providing for government ownership and virtual subsidies and "imposing additional burdens upon the people" to the extent of \$50,000,000.

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican congresses, which have kept taxes high, and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a Democratic government, and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

No "useless offices" abolished; many created. Appropriations by the present Congress, nearly \$1,700,000,000, the largest by far in the history of the country, comprising, in addition to provision for the army and navy, \$20,000,000 for a nitrate plant, \$51,000,000 for "flood control," \$85,000,000 for "good roads," \$43,000,000 for rivers and harbors and \$50,000,000 for a dubious investment in rural-credits,—four-fifths of all for the benefit of a section.

We approve the measure reported by the Democratic leaders in the House of Representatives for the creation of a council of national defense, which will determine a definite naval programme with a view to increased efficiency and economy.

Not yet, despite the obvious and greater need.

We favor a single presidential term, and to that end we urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States ineligible for re-election and we pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle.

Here we draw a veil.

The constitutional rights of American citizens should protect them on our borders and go with them throughout the world, and every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to and must be given the full protection of the United States Government, both for himself and his property.

One hundred and twelve American citizens murdered on a single ship at sea in literal compliance with official forewarning,—with no sign of either apology or disavowal from the assassin Government fifteen months after the perpetration of the crime. Hundreds of American lives and hundreds of millions of American property destroyed in Mexico,—and "protection" not only not afforded, but officially refused time and time again. "Every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to and must be given the full protection of the United States Government, both for himself and his property." The ghastly irony of it all! And the brazen humbug of pretense of "Pledges made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign!" No wonder Maud died.

Notwithstanding the brazen effrontery of the Democratic party's claim of fidelity to its promises, it would be quite unfair in the circumstances to stress the betrayal as an indictment of the President. The Baltimore platform was

Bryan's own. Mr. Wilson had no hand in its construction and was powerless, after he was nominated, to effect amendment or change. His expressed approval of it, though explicit enough, we have always regarded as more or less perfunctory and in no sense as binding upon him in every specific part. The like ordinarily would apply to the present Republican candidate, but we fear that Mr. Hughes is barred from exemption by his quickness of comprehension no less than by his constitutional inability to endorse a pronouncement which in the slightest degree conflicts with his convictions. We may then with full propriety and without compunction hold the two candidates to a strict accountability for their respective party declarations.

The differences with respect to domestic issues are less marked than ever before in our political history. The Republicans inevitably and justifiably, as it happens, pronounce "severest condemnation of the wasteful appropriations of this Administration," but in the light of the record of their own party as the most extravagant ever known their righteous indignation is far from convincing. On the other hand, the Democrats, for reasons that are distressingly apparent, prudently withhold their time-honored shibboleth of economy. Both somewhat demagogically declare for progressive labor legislation; both relegate equal suffrage to the States; both advocate development of the merchant marine, the one by subsidies, the other through government ownership; neither proposes changes in the anti-trust laws nor suggests that the railroads be exempted from their operation; both coo beguilingly to "business" and hold forth helping hands to "agriculture"; in a word, the Republican party is more radical and the Democratic party more conservative than usual, with the result that they reach substantially common ground.

The similarity is enhanced strikingly by Mr. Wilson's renunciation of the historic Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue only and his admission of the "right and power" under the Constitution, hitherto denied, to impose duties for protective purposes. The two pronouncements are:

REPUBLICANS

The Republican party stands now, as always, in the fullest sense for the policy of tariff protection to American industries and American

DEMOCRATS

We reaffirm our belief in the doctrine of a tariff for the purpose of providing sufficient revenue for the operation of the Government

labor and does not regard an anti-dumping provision as an adequate substitute. Such protection should be reasonable in amount, but sufficient to protect adequately American industry and American labor and be so adjusted as to prevent undue exactions by monopolies or trusts. It should, moreover, give special attention to securing the industrial independence of the United States as in the case of dyestuffs.

The Underwood Tariff Act is a complete failure in every respect. Under its administration imports have enormously increased in spite of the fact that intercourse with foreign countries has been largely cut off by reason of the war, while the revenues of which we stand in such dire need have been greatly reduced.

It has not in the least reduced the cost of living, which has constantly advanced from the date of its enactment. The welfare of our people demands its repeal and the substitution of a measure which in peace as well as in war will produce ample revenue and give reasonable protection to all forms of American production in mine, forest, field and factory.

We favor the creation of a Tariff Commission with complete power to gather and compile information for the use of Congress in all matters relating to the tariff.

economically administered, and unreservedly indorse the Underwood Law as truly exemplifying that doctrine.

We recognize that tariff rates are necessarily subject to change to meet changing conditions in the world's production and trade. * * * Two years of a war which has directly involved most of the chief industrial nations of the world, and which has indirectly affected the life and industry of all nations, are bringing about economic changes more varied and far-reaching than the world has ever before experienced.

In order to ascertain just what these changes may be the Democratic Congress is providing for a non-partisan Tariff Commission to make impartial and thorough study of every economic fact that may throw light either upon our past or upon our future fiscal policy with regard to the imposition of taxes on imports or with regard to the changed and changing conditions under which our trade is carried on.

We cordially indorse this timely proposal and declare ourselves in sympathy with the principle and purpose of shaping legislation within that field in accordance with clearly established facts, rather than in accordance with the demands of selfish interests or upon information provided largely, if not exclusively, by them.

The Democratic pill is sugar-coated but unmistakable. The "fundamental principle" of 1892 and 1912 is abandoned; not now, as in 1876 and 1880, shall "all custom-house taxation be for revenue only"; never again, as in 1908, shall a Republican promise to revise the tariff be heralded as "tardy recognition of the Democratic position on this question"; no longer, as in 1904, is protection "robbery of the many to enrich the few"; principle has succumbed to expediency and faith is swallowed by apprehension. Jackson, Van Buren, Tilden, Cleveland, Morrison, Hurd, Wells,

Mills and the other Wilson may turn in their graves and Watterson, Clark, Kitchin and even Bryan may toss in their beds; but the chief tenet of Democracy is sunk as deep as the *Lusitania*, and disavowal in the one case is no whit more likely than in the other. Mr. Wilson has seen a great light upon the eve of election and has put upon Protection for Protection's sake his indelible stamp of approval of "this timely proposal." The Tariff is no longer an issue. The difference is in fact one of degree only and in method of frank avowal on the one hand as against furtiveness on the other.

We surmised in April that Preparedness might appear in the campaign as a bone of contention, but there is little room for choice between the two declarations, to wit:

REPUBLICANS

In order to maintain our peace and make certain the security of our people within our own borders the country must have not only adequate, but thorough and complete national defense, ready for any emergency. We must have a sufficient and effective regular army and a provision for ample reserves, already drilled and disciplined, who can be called at once to the colors when the hour of danger comes.

We must have a navy so strong and so well proportioned and equipped, so thoroughly ready and prepared, that no enemy can gain command of the sea and effect a landing in force on either our Western or our Eastern Coast. To secure these results we must have a coherent and continuous policy of national defense, which even in these perilous days the Democratic party has utterly failed to develop, but which we promise to give to the country.

DEMOCRATS

The people of the United States love peace.

* * * but they should render themselves secure against the hazard of interference from any quarter and should be able to protect their rights upon the seas in any part of the world.

We therefore foster the maintenance of an army fully adequate to the requirements of safety and to the protection of the nation's rights, the full development of modern methods of sea coast defense and the maintenance of an adequate reserve of citizens trained to arms and prepared to safeguard the people and territory of the United States against any danger of hostile action which may unexpectedly arise; and a fixed policy for the continuous development of a navy worthy to support the great naval traditions of this nation and fully equal to the international tasks which the United States hopes and expects to take a part in performing.

Neither statement is satisfying. "Ample reserves" sounds well, but no better than "adequate reserves,"—and they are equally vague. The real question is that of the effectiveness of the National Guard as a large secondary force

and neither party faces it squarely,—the Democrats because they had committed themselves for vote-getting purposes and the Republicans because, for the same reason, they lacked the courage to speak up. So there is no issue on paper with respect to the future of Preparedness unless it be found in past delinquencies, in the holding of the War portfolio by a pronounced pacifist and in the apparent certainty, which we have seen cited somewhere, to the effect that “A vote for Wilson is a vote for Daniels.”

The pronouncements upon the predominant question of Americanism read as follows:

REPUBLICANS

We believe in American policies at home and abroad. We declare that we believe in and will enforce the protection of every American citizen in all the rights secured to him by the Constitution, treaties and the law of nations, at home and abroad, by land and sea. These rights, which in violation of the specific promise of their party made at Baltimore in 1912 the Democratic President and the Democratic Congress have failed to defend, we will unflinchingly maintain.

We appeal to all Americans, whether naturalized or native born, to prove to the world that we are Americans in thought and in deed, with one loyalty, one hope, one aspiration. We call on all Americans to be true to the spirit of America, to the great traditions of their common country and, above all things, to keep the faith.

DEMOCRATS

The Democratic party * * * summons all men, of whatever origin or creed, who would count themselves Americans to join in making clear to all the world the unity and consequent power of America.

Whoever, actuated by the purpose to promote the interest of a foreign Power, in disregard of our own country's welfare, or to injure this Government in its foreign relations, or cripple or destroy its industries at home, and whoever, by arousing prejudices of a racial, religious or other nature, creates discord and strife among our people so as to obstruct the wholesome process of unification, is faithless to the trust which the privileges of citizenship repose in him and is disloyal to his country.

We again declare the policy that the sacred rights of American citizenship must be preserved at home and abroad.

Herein the Republican party has a tremendous advantage and makes most effective appeal. No number of fair-seeming words or of belligerent but unsupported Notes can offset or palliate the humiliating failure of the Wilson Administration to safeguard the lives and properties of its nationals. Whether the Republican party—under Taft, let us say—would have done better in the trying circumstances can only be surmised, but it is quite impossible to imagine anybody doing worse. In his most presumptuous—or should we say most fighting—mood, Mr. Wilson never penned words so wholly nerveful as “*We again declare the policy that the*

sacred rights of American citizenship must be preserved at home and abroad."

Nor, frankly, can we recall anything more fatuous, though seemingly adroit, than the following:

We condemn all alliances and combinations of individuals in this country, of whatever nationality or descent, who agree and conspire together for the purpose of embarrassing or weakening our Government or of improperly influencing or coercing our public representatives in dealing or negotiating with any foreign Power. We charge that such conspiracies among a limited number exist and have been instigated for the purpose of advancing the interests of foreign countries to the prejudice and detriment of our country. We condemn any political party which, in view of the activity of such conspirators, surrenders its integrity or modifies its policy.

Since we can hardly assume that President Wilson would accuse his own personally conducted party of surrendering its integrity or modifying its policy at the behest of marplots, it follows necessarily that he is driving at the Republicans and Progressives or at their candidate. He refers, of course, to sympathizers with Germany—not, mind you, to the great body of German-born citizens whose votes, we suspect, would be quite as acceptable to him as to Mr. Hughes—but to a "limited number" of conspirators of whose activities he has been officially apprised. Speaking more explicitly on Flag Day, he said:

There is disloyalty active in the United States, and it must be absolutely crushed. It proceeds from a minority, a very small minority, but a very active and subtle minority. It works underground, but it also shows its ugly head where we can see it; and there are those at this moment who are trying to levy a species of political blackmail, saying, "Do what we wish in the interest of foreign sentiment or we will wreak our vengeance at the polls." That is the sort of thing against which the American nation will turn with a might and triumph of sentiment which will teach these gentlemen once for all that loyalty to this flag is the first test of tolerance in the United States.

Now if it be a fact—and surely no President would make so grave an accusation unless sure of his ground—that disloyalty is not only "active in the United States" but even "shows its ugly head" where he can "see it"; if, in other words, as is plainly implied, the country is infested with traitors whose whereabouts are known or discoverable, whose business is it to run them to earth and either drive them out

of the country or put them in jail? Surely the obligation does not rest upon Mr. Hughes who has neither the information nor the authority. And surely not upon a political party out of power which is neither required nor able to enforce the laws. Where then lies the duty? The accusation is of conspiracy "instigated for the purpose of advancing the interests of foreign countries to the prejudice and detriment of our own country." Whether or not such an act falls technically within the Constitutional definition of treason as "adhering to their (the United States's) enemies, giving them aid and comfort," it comes perilously near it and, in any case, it constitutes a crime punishable under laws which either exist already or could be obtained in a day's time.

There was no difficulty in sending Huerta to prison to die, though for what offense nobody knows. Why are the officers of justice impotent in the present instance? The Constitution fixes the responsibility and confers the authority upon the President himself. If he possesses the information, why does he not act instead of meaninglessly warning political opponents against "surrendering their integrity" and "modifying their policy"? We can understand why the adversaries of a candidate for re-election might call him to task for failure to heed his oath to enforce the laws, but self-accusation on the part of a President himself is, we venture to assert, no less unprecedented than it is amazing. The most charitable conclusion is that the charge itself either lacks foundation or could not be sustained or is mere political buncombe of the cuttle-fish variety.

So much for the platforms except as they apply to Mexico, which calls for fuller consideration in a separate chapter.

We find, therefore, no reason for changing our opinion that the ultimate issue will be one of sincerity based upon character.

HUGHES or WILSON? That's all.

UNPREPAREDNESS DEMONSTRATED

MILITARY unpreparedness is now tangibly demonstrated. Some details of the matter of the forwarding of the National Guard to the Mexican frontier may still be controversial. Of some essential features of the case there is no room for question, and these are sufficient to show the urgent need of

a far higher degree of efficiency and a far greater degree of preparation than now exist.

The chief counts in the indictment are three. One is that of equipment. It is indisputable that some levies of the National Guard were held at their home camps for some time because supplies of clothing, etc., were not forthcoming from Washington; in at least one case for so long a time that the State authorities seriously considered providing the supplies themselves. It is also indisputable that some of the troops were landed in the semi-tropical climate of Texas in mid-summer with nothing but heavy winter clothing. Compare this with the German system, under which there has always been for every reservist, whether he was at home in Germany or had emigrated to the United States or to South America, on file in the arsenals a complete outfit of clothing and all other needed articles, made from measure to fit him perfectly, and tagged with his name. Millions of men, called to the colors, could thus be perfectly equipped without an hour's delay. We need not demand quite such a system as that of Germany in insisting that our own readiness should be more complete than it has on this occasion appeared to be.

The second point was that of transportation. Men were packed into antiquated wooden day coaches, so old and dilapidated that there seemed some justification for the suggestion that they were the same in which troops had been shipped to the front in 1861! There was much delay in providing even such accommodations, troops being kept waiting for hours before they were entrained, and then kept lying in train yards, or shunted to and fro on sidings for hours more. Now it is all very well to say that it is a part of the soldier's duty to endure discomforts and hardships. But there are enough of these that are inevitable without adding others that are unnecessary and avoidable. Such treatment of the troops in the process of mobilization did much more than cause discomfort. It caused delay, which might have been costly if not disastrous, and it impaired the efficiency of the troops after they had reached their destination. Instead of being landed in Texas in good condition, "fit as a fiddle," they were landed there jaded and worn and needing some time to recover from the hardships and privations of the passage.

The third point was that of food. Both on the journey and after reaching their destination many of the troops suf-

ferred the pangs of hunger. We heard indisputably authentic stories of some being twenty-four hours without food, and even with an insufficient supply of drinking water. Also on some occasions the hungry men took matters into their own hands and forcibly raided eating houses. This latter was, of course, a reprehensible thing to do. Soldiers should preserve the peace, not break it. But starving men are not always squeamish over the law of *meum et tuum*. If the men were culpable for stealing the food, those who drove them through famine to desperation were not blameless. Nor can we accept as convincing the statement that the sufficient regulation rations were supplied to the men, but they, being greenhorns in the service, were wasteful of it and did not make it last as they should have done. To say that is simply to shift the burden of unpreparedness. If it be true the commissary department may be absolved from blame. But what is to be said of those responsible for the training and discipline and instruction of the men—in brief, for their preparedness? Surely men who had been enlisted for some time, most of them for years, in the National Guard, should have been taught how to conserve their supplies. If they were not, one of the essentials of preparedness was lacking.

There can be no exculpation on the ground of excessive demand. The number of troops mobilized was small, so small as to be trifling in comparison with the multitudes transported in the great European armies. Ours were numbered by tens of thousands; theirs by hundreds of thousands and even by millions. What should we have done if we had been called upon to equip and transport the million men who Mr. Bryan said would spring to arms in a day at the President's call? Nor can we accept the plea of distance, which of course could have nothing to do with the matter of equipment or accommodations, but with only that of time in transportation. Great Britain has transported more troops from India, from Canada, from Australia and from New Zealand, to France, than we have sent across the country to Texas. Russia has probably sent as many, all the way across Asia to the Pacific Ocean and thence through the Indian Ocean and the Suez Canal and Mediterranean.

Least of all is there validity in the plea of unexpected emergency. The fact is that we had abundant warning. For three years we had been confronting a Mexican problem

which involved potential intervention. For months actual military operations had been in progress and the probability of vastly greater operations had been recognized. The whole nation had been expecting just what did actually happen—the sending of our whole available army and a large contingent of the National Guard to the border, if not into Mexico itself. And after those months of warning and of knowledge, we were unprepared.

It is not pleasant to say these things. But it is immeasurably less pleasant to have such things happen. Indeed this deplorable and costly lack of readiness is largely to be charged to the failure of men to speak out plainly about our slipshod and happy-go-lucky way of doing things. We have cast unmeasured scorn upon the Third Empire in France, which boasted that the army was ready “to the last shoe button” only to find that a whole army had been provided with shoes all for the right foot. Was it better to ship an army to the tropics with nothing but Arctic clothing?

This is the third lesson within the memory of living men. The first was in 1861, when it took two years to “lick into shape” the army which was to win the war—to develop Gettysburg from Bull Run. The second was in 1898, the memories of which, at Chickamauga and Key West and elsewhere are still as ghastly as they are green. Surely this third lesson should be sufficient to teach us that we are after all “as common mortals.” This may be, as our Fourth of July orators were recently saying, the greatest country on the surface of the globe, and we may be the greatest people. We are glad to believe that it is so. But it cannot be made so simply by our much boasting of it. The country must be great through the superior development, conservation and utilization of its resources, and the people must be great through the possession and exercise of the essential qualities of greatness. There is after all nothing in the country or in us that exempts America from the universal laws of nature and of nations. We cannot win battles without armies, any more than anyone else. Neither can we, any more than anyone else, have efficient armies without adequate preparation.

A TREATY IN CHANCERY

OUR Nicaraguan treaty seems to be in chancery. After years of delay it has at last been ratified, and the ratifica-

tions have been exchanged. There would in ordinary circumstances, therefore, be nothing more to do but to proclaim it in force, and to act upon it as a part of the supreme law of the land. But the circumstances are not ordinary. They are extraordinary, if not unique. An international court is, we are told, about to intervene; if it has not already done so. It will deny the right of Nicaragua to make the treaty, on the ground that it would be injurious to the interests of other states which are not parties to it. Nicaragua will thus be confronted with the alternative of either repudiating the treaty which she has already made, or of placing herself in contempt of court and thus incurring a grave penalty. The United States, too, will be confronted with a similar alternative. It must, apparently, either repudiate the treaty or discredit and repudiate the decree of a court to which it is, indeed, not technically subject, but which it is morally bound in the strongest way to respect and to sustain.

These are the circumstances: Costa Rica and Salvador protest against the treaty, as inimical to their interests and as traversing their sovereign rights. The grievance of the former is an old one, with which we have hitherto several times been concerned. It pertains to the San Juan River, which forms a part of the boundary between Costa Rica and Nicaragua, and which also forms an important part of the potential canal route across that isthmus. Away back in the early canal negotiations, before the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, Costa Rica insisted that half of that river, and therefore half of the proposed route, belonged to her, and that therefore she must be reckoned with, equally with Nicaragua. As a rule the United States dodged that issue and made its bargains with Nicaragua alone, leaving that country to fight the matter out with Costa Rica as best she could. More than once actual war was thus provoked between those two republics. Finally a treaty was made known as the Canaz-Jarez treaty, recognizing the rights of Costa Rica and binding Nicaragua not to make any canal grants across her territory without consulting Costa Rica and securing her assent. The validity of that treaty has been formally recognized by the United States. Yet we have made with Nicaragua a treaty by which such a canal grant is at least potentially made, and Nicaragua has made it with us without ever consulting Costa Rica or securing her assent. Costa Rica therefore quite logically claims that in so doing Nicaragua is

violating the Canaz-Jarez treaty, and it is said that the court will sustain her in that claim.

The protest of Salvador is based upon other grounds. The treaty between Nicaragua and the United States grants to this country certain Nicaraguan lands in and about the Bay of Fonseca, for coaling and naval stations. That will be an immensely useful and valuable grant. But it so happens that Salvador and Honduras also front, as well as Nicaragua, upon the Bay of Fonseca, and our possession of a station there would therefore control their access to the Pacific Ocean through its waters. In the absence of any treaty upon the subject, Salvador holds that in equity Nicaragua ought not to make such a cession without the assent of the other two Powers, and without satisfactory arrangements for the protection of their interests. That contention also seems logical, and again it is said that it is, or will be, sustained by the court.

But what is this court, which thus assumes to exercise jurisdiction over our treaties? That is the most interesting feature in the whole case, and the one which most emphasizes our moral obligations toward it. The tribunal in question is the Central American Court of Justice, in some respects the most advanced international tribunal in the world. It is constituted by the five Central American states, one of its five judges being from each of them, and to it the five states have bound themselves "to submit all controversies or questions which may arise among them, of whatsoever nature and no matter what their origin may be, in case the respective Departments of Foreign Affairs should not have been able to reach an understanding." That is to say, it is designed to be for Central America all that the tribunal at The Hague is designed to be—but never yet has been—to all the world. Of its jurisdiction over the present case there can be no question. Nor can there be any question that Nicaragua is bound to obey its decrees.

The United States, however, is not one of the constituents of the court and does not recognize its jurisdiction. But does it not? Or should it not? It is true that the United States was not one of the signatories of the treaty establishing that court, and is not mentioned in the treaty as a Power subject to its jurisdiction. Nevertheless, that treaty was made at Washington, at a conference of the Central American republics held there at our instance and invitation. The

United States was represented in the conference, though in only an advisory capacity. It exercised a marked moral supervision over all the proceedings, and nothing was done in them that it did not approve. The United States is, therefore, as much interested, morally, in the court, and is as much bound to honor its decisions and to support its authority and integrity, as any of the Central American states themselves. We simply cannot afford to disregard, or to countenance Nicaragua in disregarding, a decree of that court, even though its purpose be the annulling of a treaty which we have made and which we very greatly desire to have fulfilled.

Yet we cannot well afford to let this treaty lapse, for some of its provisions are of vital importance to our peace and comfort. What, then, is the answer to the question? What is the solution of the problem? It is not difficult to find. President Wilson suggested it in advance of the rising of the problem, when he expressed the wish that we might make with every other Central American state a treaty similar to that with Nicaragua. That would mean, of course, recognition of the interests of Salvador, Costa Rica and Honduras in the provisions of the Nicaraguan treaty. It would perhaps mean some compensation to them, or at least some assurances concerning our intentions toward them. To that recognition they are entitled. It would be stultifying to deny it. To such assurances they are also entitled. As to compensation, pecuniary or otherwise, that is a question requiring careful consideration. We should not advocate paying subsidies, bonuses or what not unnecessarily. But it would be far better, even pecuniarily more economical, to make a liberal payment to each of those countries, than to incur the suspicion and ill-will of them and a feeling that we are trying to overreach them, to discredit their international court, and to back one in an unjust attitude toward others.

To enforce the Nicaraguan treaty in the face of protests and a judicial decision against it would be to discredit the whole group of beneficent treaties among the Central American states, of which we were the moral sponsor; it would be to set back relations among those states, from the present enlightened and auspicious ground, to the very worst of the old-time status; and it would be to incur for ourselves their suspicion, distrust and animosity. Such a misfortune can be averted, and the high designs of the Central American

treaties and of our own treaty with Nicaragua can be promoted and their fulfilment assured, by judicious and equitable diplomacy. The Nicaraguan treaty should not be abandoned, but it should be duplicated *mutatis mutandis*, between the United States and each of the other four Central American states. That would rescue the Nicaraguan treaty from chancery, and it would secure for it, and for all details of our transactions with our neighbors, the approval and ratification of the international court of justice.

THE PRESIDENT AND "THE PORK BARREL."

"PORK" we have always with us. Periodically there comes up in Congress a Bill for Loot. Generally it is ostensibly for river and harbor improvement. Sometimes it is for public buildings. Now and then it is not a whole bill but a mere "rider" on another measure. Always the object is the same. It is to "fix the fences" of members of Congress by spending large amounts of public money in their districts. Many constituencies estimate the worth of their Representatives by the amount of the appropriations which are thus secured. It is a common thing in "campaign literature" and campaign speeches to have a candidate for re-election say, in substance:

"I have been your Representative for six years. In that time I have secured appropriations aggregating one million dollars to be spent in this district. I got \$60,000 for a post-office at Squedunk, \$50,000 for a Federal Building at Wayback, \$40,000 each for postoffices at Lonelyville and Skunk's Misery, and \$600,000 for the dredging of Catfish Creek. It is my purpose, if re-elected, to secure ample appropriations for the draining of Tadpole Swamp, and for the erection of public buildings at Podunk, Huckleberry Crossroads and Happy Hooligan."

Whereupon the free and enlightened electors of the Nineteenth New Jersey District say with one accord, "That's the kind of a man to have at Washington. 'Rah for Stiggins and an appropriation!"

Now, the general principle of public works is good, and some of the details of most of these bills are good. Paradoxically speaking, the good parts of them are their worst parts. That is to say, there are items for buildings or improvements

which are not only desirable but actually indispensable and imperative. These are conjoined with the most unblushing "steals," for the cunning reason that all must stand or fall together, and nobody will incur the odium of voting against these good proposals and therefore they will have to vote for the bad ones, too; and the President will not veto appropriations which he knows to be absolutely necessary, and therefore he will have to approve the graft as well. Sometimes, indeed, the advocates of good causes actively support bad ones, because they need the support of the grafters who are interested in them to secure the passage of their own praiseworthy items. The whole thing is a mixture of "log-rolling" and blackmail. "You vote for my appropriation," says Smith to Jones; "and I'll vote for yours." Again, "If you don't vote for digging out Catfish Creek and pumping water into it so as to make it navigable," says Tubbs to Nubbs, "I'll oppose your item for making the East River deep enough for warships to get to and from the Navy Yard."

So the bill goes through, with all its contained "pork," and is laid before the President. He must either sign it as a whole or veto it as a whole. He knows that the Navy Yard channel urgently needs deepening. He knows that some public buildings provided for are imperatively necessary. But to secure those appropriations he must also approve the Catfish Creek and Wayback postoffice graft. What is he to do? Defeat measures which are necessary for the public good? Or permit unblushing thefts of public funds? The dilemma is one which for decency's sake should never be presented to any President. He should never be called upon to make such a choice. Whichever way he decides, he is sure to incur reproach.

This grave embarrassment of the President, and this outrage upon the public welfare, could easily be averted. That could be done by the simple and reasonable expedient of investing the President of the United States with the same power and discretion which Governors of most of the States have long enjoyed, to-wit, the authority to exercise discrimination in dealing with appropriation bills, so as to approve some items while disapproving others. In about three-fourths of the States the Governors have that power, and they exercise it, to the great advantage of the public treasury. Thus the Constitution of the State of New York pro-

vides that "If any bill presented to the Governor contains several items of appropriations of money, he may object to one or more of such items, while approving the other portion of the bill." The constitutions of thirty-four of the States contain similar provisions.

Such a provision does not always prevent "grabs" and "pork." It does prevent "log-rolling" through the mixture of good and bad items in a single bill. It compels every proposed appropriation to stand or fall according to its own merits, and it fixes unerringly the responsibility for each. Moreover, it relieves the Executive of a responsibility which never should be imposed upon him, and it does place upon him a responsibility which he ought to bear. No Executive can complain at being required to decide whether or not to approve a certain appropriation, when it stands alone, upon its own merits.

The whole, saith Euclid, is greater than any of its parts. Why should not the President of the United States have at least as much authority in Federal affairs as the Governor of one of the States has in State affairs? Why not put into the Constitution of the United States a provision for discrimination among items of appropriation, similar to that which is in most of the State constitutions? It would be interesting to see how the champions of "pork" in Congress would regard such a proposal.

THE PASSING OF THE TURK

"It is Kismet." The Arab has risen against the Turk. The holy cities of Islam have been wrested by Moslems from Ottoman control. The spiritual leadership of the Mohammedan world has passed away from the banks of the Bosphorus. Kismet has overcome the descendants of the Black Khan. That may not be, to all observers, the chief surprise of the war; or any surprise at all. There can be little doubt that to Germany, and particularly to the German Emperor personally, it is the culmination of one of the chief disappointments of the war. To the world at large it is a circumstance as important as it is interesting.

The full purport of the Arab revolt is to be appreciated only through a brief review of its antecedents. Years ago, as if in preparation for the present war, the German Em-

peror made extraordinary overtures and approaches to Turkey. He repudiated Bismarck's famous dictum, that the whole Balkan Peninsula was not worth the bones of a single Pomeranian grenadier. He hob-nobbed with the Sultan. He refused to join the other Powers in protecting Christian peoples from Mohammedan oppression and in compelling the Porte to fulfill its treaty engagements. He posed as the friend of the Sultan and as his protector and champion against the hostility of Russia and the other European Powers. Also, not content with mere words, he secured exclusive concessions, by virtue of which Germany was to have something like a monopoly of Turkish commerce, and was to traverse the Turkish Empire in Asia with a vast system of German railroads; one running through Anatolia and Mesopotamia to the Persian Gulf, and another branching from this down through Palestine and Arabia, through the Hedjaz and Yemen, to the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb.

The strategy was obvious, and masterly. It was two-fold. In time of peace the railroads and commercial concessions would make the Ottoman Empire little more than a colony, or a protectorate of Germany. German influence would be paramount. German profits from the exportation of the country would be enormous. Germany, moreover, would be in possession of the two great land trade routes to the East, running trains directly from Berlin to the shores of the Persian Gulf, and to the shores of the Gulf of Aden. Russia's Central Asia route would be out-rivalled by a shorter one to the Arabian Gulf, and the Suez Canal and Red Sea route would be paralleled by rail at least as far as Aden, if not to Muscat. For the attainment of such ends alone the scheme was well worth while.

But there were other ends, even more important. In case of the war which even then was forecast the advantages to Germany would be incalculable. The strategic value of the Asian railroads would be enormous. German armies could command the Arabian shore of the Red Sea and hold the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, barring the Suez route between Europe and Asia. A German army could be placed at the head of the Persian Gulf. But it might not be necessary to send German armies thither. A German-Turkish alliance would range the whole Mohammedan world upon the Kaiser's side. A Mohammedan uprising in India and Egypt would paralyze Great Britain; a similar movement in Cen-

tral Asia would embarrass Russia; and France would be left without any efficient ally. The Teutonic power in Europe plus the Mohammedan power in Asia and Africa, would dominate the entire Eastern Hemisphere. Such were the visions of years ago, which possessed the Kaiser's mind; though whether he imparted them fully to his prospective ally at Constantinople, may be a matter of doubt.

Early in the present war vigorous and confident efforts were made to fulfill the grandiose design. Turkey was brought into the war as Germany's ally. German emissaries were sent to all Mohammedan countries, to incite a Jihad, or Holy War. They were busy at Delhi, at Cairo, and at Cabul. Entreaty, temptation and command were freely employed to dragoon the entire Mohammedan world into an uprising against the Allies. The religious obligation of obeying the Sultan, as the Caliph of Islam, was urged. The bait of independence of British rule was dangled before Indian and Egyptian eyes. If reports are to be credited, most fantastic means were employed to seduce the popular mind. Portraits of the German Emperor in Turkish garb, with turban and scimeter, were everywhere distributed, with the caption "Wilhelm Pasha, Caliph of Germany"; and it was unblushingly affirmed that he and all Germany had embraced the Mohammedan faith and were waging this war for its extension throughout the world.

Never was there a more audacious scheme. Never was one more futile. "I can call spirits from the vasty deep," said Glendower. "But will they come when you do call for them!" demanded Hotspur. The Moslem tribes and nations were bidden to a Holy War. But with one accord they were deaf unto the call. Egypt remained loyal. The Afghan Ameer made it the part of life-saving discretion for the German agents to retire swiftly from Cabul. Bokhara and Turkestan adhered to the Russian crown. In India, where Germany's supreme hopes were based, prince vied with prince in offering treasure and levies to the Kaiser, but it was not the Deutsches Kaiser, but the Kaiser-I-Hind. The sentiment of the hundred million Mohammedans in India was voiced by Aga Khan, when he said: "Germany and Austria have been no disinterested friends of Islam. While the one took Bosnia, the other has long been plotting to become the Suzerain of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia. If Germany succeeds, which Heaven forbid! Turkey will become only a vas-

sal of Germany, and the Kaiser's Resident will be the real ruler of Turkey and will control the Holy Cities. . . ."

The disappointment of the German scheme has not, however, been merely negative, in the refusal of Islam to rise in Jihad. It has become also positive and aggressive, in the actual revolt of Arabia against Turkey and her Teutonic allies. The Yemen has long been disaffected. Indeed, that cradle of the Arab race has never been fully submissive to Turkish rule, regarding the Tribe of Othman as immeasurably inferior to the stock from which the Prophet himself sprang, and it has been little more than nominally a part of the Turkish Empire. But now not merely the Yemen, but the Hedjaz, too, has revolted and renounced all allegiance to the Turkish Sultan. It is in the Hedjaz that Mecca and Medinah, and their port of Jeddah, are situated, the Holy Cities of the Moslem world.

This is in fulfillment of prophecy. Said Aga Khan, in the address already quoted: "Turkey was the trustee of Islam, and the whole world was content to let her hold our Holy Cities in her keeping. Now that she has so disastrously showed herself a tool in German hands, she has not only ruined herself, but has lost her position of trustee of Islam; and evil will overtake her." That was said long ago, before there was a symptom of the Arab revolt. Now it is fulfilled.

It will be recalled that early in the war the British-Indian Government pledged itself to keep the Holy Cities of Arabia, and also the Moslem shrines in Mesopotamia and elsewhere, "immune from attacks or molestation by British naval or military forces, so long as there was no interference with pilgrims from India to the places and shrines in question." Evidently the Sheriff of Mecca and the Arabian chieftains and people generally trust that assurance, and have resolved to look to Great Britain for protection rather than to Germany. The significance of it upon the progress of the war will not be inconsiderable, while the effect of it upon the readjustment of affairs at the end of the war cannot fail to be very great. Whatever may be the political fate of the Turkish Empire, it may be regarded as certain that its spiritual hegemony of the Mohammedan world is gone forever.

The first clash between the Christian Powers of Europe and the Mohammedans of Asia arose over the control by the latter of Jerusalem and the other Holy Places of Christendom; though that was before the rise of the Ottoman Tribe,

and it was with the Seljuks that the Crusaders battled. It is an interesting coincidence that this latest clash involves the control of the Holy Places of the Mohammedans, and that it is likely to result in a permanent transfer of that control from the hands of the Turks to the hands of the Arabs. "It is Kismet"; and it is peculiarly fitting that it should be so. For while the doctrine of Kismet is characteristic of the entire Mohammedan faith, it is the Ottoman Turks alone who have exaggerated it into an excuse for political inefficiency and decadence. Islam will doubtless continue to exist, but the Ottoman Sultan will not be its Caliph. It will not be surprising to see the seat of supreme authority shifted from the shore of the Bosphorus to the shore of the Red Sea, and to see the birthplace of Mohammedanism become once more its capital.